



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| 10/616,157 | 07/09/2003 | Joseph Du | N1085-00099 | 9753 |
| 54657 | 7590 | 07/26/2006 | EXAMINER | |
| DUANE MORRIS LLP IP DEPARTMENT (TSMC) 30 SOUTH 17TH STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-4196 | | | ROSE, HELENE ROBERTA | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2163 | |

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/616,157

Applicant(s)

DU ET AL.

Examiner

Helene R. Rose

Art Unit

2163

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on May 11, 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 and 34-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 33 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 and 34-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

1. In response to communications filed on May 11, 2006, claims 1,6,11,16,21,26,31-32 and 34-38 have been amended; Claim 33 was cancelled; Claims 39-42 were added.
2. Therefore, claims 1-32 and 34-42 are presently pending in this application.
3. Applicant's arguments filed on May 11, 2006 have been fully considered have been fully considered (MPEP 714.04; 37 CFR 1.111) but they are not persuasive, but are in view of new prior art as it is applied to the amended claims, which necessitate for a new ground of rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
5. Claims 1-30 and 34-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes et al (US Patent No. 5,893,074/Date of Patent: April 6, 1999) in view of Day et al (US Patent No. 6,684,212, Filing Date of Patent: November 6, 2000).

Claims 1,6,21 and 26:

Regarding claims 1,6, 21 and 26, discloses a method/computer readable medium utilizing the same functionality, Hughes teaches a method/computer readable medium for managing a project (column 4, lines 25-27, wherein the invention effectively manages and controls large-scale, complex projects and column 5, lines 24-26, wherein a computational component is a computer program written in a language which is compatible with the database Hughes), comprising:

(a) receiving data representing attributes of a project from a project manager, the project comprising at least one task (Figure 2A and 2B, all features and column 5, lines 56-58, wherein a contract defining the particular product to be delivered or received is established for each of these relationships using the schedule-control method as defined in column 5, lines 44-51, Hughes);

(b) receiving data identifying attributes of the task (column 5, lines 63-67, Hughes); means for receiving data identifying an assignment of each task to at least one task- responsible person, (column 6, lines 17-23, wherein first set of input data identifies and defines the product, Hughes);

(c) assigning the at least one task to at least one task-responsible person (column 5, lines 9-15, wherein each task is defined by a contract between at least two responsible parties, a receiver and supplier of the product, wherein a contract is defined to be written agreement which is equivalent to assigning, Hughes),

Hughes discloses all the limitations above. Hughes also discloses a contract containing information, along with names, wherein naming the product is equivalent to names (column 2, lines 12-16 and lines 36-45, Hughes). However, Hughes does not disclose wherein assigning the at least one task comprises providing candidate data representing attributes of candidates for the task-responsible person, the candidate data comprising field of expertise, and workload. On the other hand Day discloses wherein assigning the at least one task comprises providing candidate data representing attributes of candidates for the task-responsible person, the candidate data comprising field of expertise, and workload Figure 20, diagram 332, wherein PAD name, diagram 336, wherein organizational is equivalent to field of expertise, Figure 10, wherein priority is equivalent to workload, Figure 13, diagram 220, wherein new team template is equivalent to contract information and Figure 17, all features, Day). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to modify Hughes with Day system by incorporating a workload ethic. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to for the purpose of productivity, management of work activities to be completed in a timely manner.

(d) automatically providing a notice to the task-responsible person, the notice identifying the assignment of the task (column 4, lines 56-67, wherein output data indicates the project status wherein its interpreted to be identifying the assignment of task, and column 10, lines 29-33, wherein remainders are sent over the electronic use interface and wherein the remainders provides a mechanism for suppliers and receivers to complete their particular product or task and the computational component is programmed to automatically send emails through the interface to the reasonable parties, Hughes);

(e) receiving at least one task report from the corresponding task-responsible person (column 8, lines 55-57, wherein the task report states no deliverable and the supplier agrees to deliver the product with the current name to form an agreement, Hughes);

(f) providing the corresponding task-responsible person and the project manager to edit the task report (column 11, lines 38-44, wherein a form is completed by all Technical Managers before working on a task and wherein empowered users create, view, edit, and print WPA's 70 using the WPA's 30 system and wherein each WPA 70 documents the task by including its title 72, date 74, users who perform the work 76, the objectives of the task 78, and a description of the approach used to work on the task 80, Hughes);

(g) providing at least one other person to have a read-only access to the task report (column 8, lines 10-13, wherein the product was reconciled and the supplier cannot make the original agreed-to delivery date, and has changed it to a later date, Hughes).

Claims 2, 12, and 22:

Regarding claims 2, 12, and 22, Hughes teaches wherein the project comprises a plurality of tasks (Figure 1, diagrams 14a-14d, Hughes);

the means for receiving attribute data identified attributes of each of a plurality of tasks (Figure 1, diagrams 15a-15d, Hughes); and

the report receiving means receives a plurality of task reports from a plurality of corresponding task-responsible persons (Figure 1, diagrams 16, 18, and 20, wherein data are processed and analyzed with the computational component 20 to generate output data for the suppliers and receivers and wherein output data are stored in the relational database 18, and these data are accessed via electronic user interface 16 by various suppliers and receivers involved with the project as defined in column 5, lines 27-32, Hughes).

Claims 3,13, and 23:

Regarding claims 3,13, 23, Hughes teaches wherein means for receiving assignment data identifies the assignment of at least one other person having read-only access to the task report. (column 8, lines 10-13, wherein the product was reconciled and the supplier cannot make the original agreed-to delivery date, and has changed it to a later date, Hughes).

Claims 4,14, and 24:

Regarding claims 4, 14, and 24, Hughes teaches means for automatically providing a notice to the project manager upon completion of one of the tasks (column 10, lines 29-33, wherein remainders are sent over the electronic use interface and wherein the remainders provides a mechanism for suppliers and receivers to complete their particular product or task and the computational component is programmed to automatically send emails through the interface to the reasonable parties, Hughes).

Claims 5,10,15,20,25,and 30:

Regarding claims 5, 10, 15, 20, 25 and 30, Hughes teaches wherein the data identifying attributes of the task contain a due date (column 10, lines 61-62, Hughes), the system further comprising:

means for automatically providing a notice to the task-responsible person (column 10, lines 29-33, Hughes), the notice identifying the due date (column 10, lines 23-27, wherein new reports which identify both remaining unrecognized receivable/deliverable products and broken agreements, Hughes),

the notice being provided a predetermined number of days before the due date (column 7, lines 11-15, Hughes).

Claims 7, 17, and 27:

Regarding claims 7, 17, and 27, Hughes teaches wherein the attribute data receiving means receives data representing attributes of a plurality of items (column 4, lines 56-60, Hughes); and the report receiving means receives a plurality of item reports from a plurality of corresponding item-responsible persons (column 6, lines 17-23, wherein first set of input data identifies and defines the product, Hughes).

Claims 8, 18, and 28:

Regarding claims 8, 18, and 28, Hughes teaches wherein the assignment data receiving means identifies the assignment of the at least one other person having read-only access to the item report (column 8, lines 10-13, wherein the product was reconciled and the supplier cannot make the original agreed-to delivery date, and has changed it to a later date, Hughes).

Claims 9, 19, and 29:

Regarding claims 9, 19, and 29, Hughes teaches means for automatically providing a notice to the corresponding task-responsible person upon completion of one of items (column 4, lines 56-67, wherein output data indicates the project status wherein its interpreted to be identifying the assignment of task, and column 10, lines 29-33, wherein remainders are sent over the electronic use interface and wherein the remainders provides a mechanism for suppliers and receivers to complete their particular product or task and the computational component is programmed to automatically send emails through the interface to the reasonable parties, Hughes).

Claims 11 and 26:

Regarding claims 11 and 26, discloses a computer implemented system/computer readable medium utilizing the same functionality, Hughes teaches a computer-implemented system/computer

readable medium for managing a project (column 4, lines 25-27, wherein the invention effectively manages and controls large-scale, complex projects and column 5, lines 24-26, wherein a computational component is a computer program written in a language which is compatible with the database Hughes), comprising:

(a) means for receiving data representing attributes of a project from a project manager, the project comprising at least one task (Figure 2A and 2B, all features and column 5, lines 56-58, wherein a contract defining the particular product to be delivered or received is established for each of these relationships using the schedule-control method as defined in column 5, lines 44-51, Hughes);

(b) means for receiving data identifying attributes of the task (column 5, lines 63-67, Hughes);

(c) **means for providing candidate data representing attributes of candidates for a task-responsible person, the candidate data comprising candidate names, field expertise, workload and contact information** (REFER to claim 1, wherein this limitation has already been addressed, Day);

(d) means for receiving data identifying an assignment of each task to at least one task-responsible person, (column 6, lines 17-23, wherein first set of input data identifies and defines the product, Hughes);

(e) means for automatically providing a notice to the task-responsible person, the notice identifying the assignment of the task (column 4, lines 56-67, wherein output data indicates the project status wherein its interpreted to be identifying the assignment of task, and column 10, lines 29-33, wherein remainders are sent over the electronic use interface and wherein the remainders provides a mechanism for suppliers and receivers to complete their particular product or task and the computational component is programmed to automatically send emails through the interface to the reasonable parties, Hughes);

(f) means for receiving at least one task report from the corresponding task-responsible person (column 8, lines 55-57, wherein the task report states no deliverable and the supplier agrees to deliver the product with the current name to form an agreement, Hughes);

(g) a database storing data representing attributes of the project, data identifying attributes of the task, data identifying an assignment of the at least one task, and the task report (column 4, lines 27-34, wherein using an electronic user interface, relational database, and computational component and these features are designed to process input data organized in a preferred rec/del format, wherein this format effectively separates the project into a series of smaller tasks, each of which involves a contract between a supplier and a receiver, and wherein each contract relates in some way to the production of a product, and column 5, lines 21-32, wherein data is stored in database are then analyzed with a computational component to determine the contract and states of each product, Hughes);

(e) means for permitting the corresponding task-responsible person and the project manager to edit the task report (column 11, lines 38-44, wherein a form is completed by all Technical Managers before working on a task and wherein empowered users create, view, edit, and print WPA's 70 using the WPA's 30 system and wherein each WPA 70 documents the task by including its title 72, date 74, users who perform the work 76, the objectives of the task 78, and a description of the approach used to work on the task 80, Hughes);

(f) means for permitting at least one other person to have a read-only access to the task report (column 8, lines 10-13, wherein the product was reconciled and the supplier cannot make the original agreed-to delivery date, and has changed it to a later date, Hughes).

Claim 34:

Regarding claim 34, Hughes teaches wherein the entity data comprises entity-identifying data, entity-products data, and entity-finance data (Figure 8, all features, wherein entity finance data is interpreted to be the baseline plan and Figure 4, diagrams 140, wherein entity is defined to be something

that has separate and distinct existence and objective or conceptual reality and Figure 6, diagram 72, wherein the work package agreement (WPA) is defining it's entities as in Project Planning, Science Management Plan, and so forth, Hughes);

Claim 35:

Regarding claim 35, wherein the evidence data comprises product-analysis data and associated publication data (Figure 8, all features, wherein it shows a planned versus actual graph plotting the status of series of products over a twelve week period of the project, Hughes).

Claim 36:

Regarding claim 36, Hughes teaches wherein the product-analysis data comprises an outside reverse-engineering report and an internal reverse-engineering report (column 4, lines 44-49, wherein reverse engineering is defined to be a method of analyzing a product in which the finished item is studied to determine its makeup or component parts and column 5, lines 9-15, wherein the project is broken down into a series of large scale tasks, and each large scale task is broken into smaller tasks, and each task results in a product and wherein products are designs, mechanical, or electrical parts, tests, or reports, Hughes)

Claim 37:

Regarding claim 37, Hughes teaches wherein the associated publication data comprises paper publication data and website-publication data (column 10, lines 10-15, wherein the output data can indicate a project history which is maintained by a comparison between the current and previous states of the various products of the project and wherein the output data are preferably sent electronically over the electronic user interface, and output data can be printed on paper and distributed to suppliers and receivers, Hughes).

Claim 38:

Regarding claim 38, Hughes teaches means for receiving a search query (column 9, lines 30-40, wherein the receiver inputs a date, and the supplier inputs available date, and wherein the product is reconciled and no action is required, Hughes);

means for searching the database (column 9, lines 52-54, wherein the receiver finds a way to receive the product on the original date, Hughes); and

means for presenting a search result (column 9, lines 58-65, wherein the two parties continues until a resolution is reached, Hughes).

Claim 40:

Regarding claim 40, teaches wherein the patent opinion is prepared as part of a defensive project planning concerning a specific patent identifier by a competitor (Figure 6, all features and column 11, lines 48-58, Hughes).

Claim 42:

Regarding claim 42, wherein the request includes a specific question to be addressed by the patent opinion and a specific format for the opinion (Figure 22, all features, further defined in column 11, lines 8-27, Day).

6. **Claims 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes et al (US Patent No. 5,893,074/Date of Patent: April 6, 1999) in view of Day et al (US Patent No. 6,684,212, Filing Date of Patent: November 6, 2000) and in further view of Uchio et al (US Publication No. 2002/0019836, Date of Patent: February 14, 2002).**

Claim 31:

Regarding claim 31, Hughes teaches a computer-implemented opinion integration system (column 4, lines 38-42, wherein data may not agree with the supplier schedule, wherein opinion can also be referred to as a decision, judgment or ruling, Hughes), comprising:

(a) means for receiving a plurality of patent related data (Figure 4, all features, wherein a plurality of patent data consist of identification number, name, due date, received date, and so forth and columns 10-11 lines 54-67, lines 1-5, Hughes),

Hughes and Day disclose all the limitations above. However, Hughes and Day do not disclose **wherein the patent data comprises at least patent claims, the patent specification and patent abstract**. On the other hand, Uchio disclose (Figure 4, diagrams 404 and 405, wherein it is inheritance that an patent application consist of a specification, abstract and claims and Figure 6, all features, wherein specification, abstract is defined, and section [0195], wherein claims is defined, Uchio). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to modify Hughes and Day system to incorporate Uchio for not only providing a faster workload ethic but applying the improved method to processing timely patent applications. A skilled artisan would motivated to so by implementing integration, file sharing, in which work is assigned to a user based their present workload activity, which will help monitor, as well as produce the efficiency of patent applications.

(b) means for sending a request for an **patent** opinion associated with the patent related data to a predetermined person (Figure 3A, diagram 53, Hughes);

(c) means for receiving the **patent** opinion details (Figures 5-8, all features, wherein details of the patent application are illustrated, Day);

(d) a database for associating the **patent** opinion with the patent related data and for storing the **patent** opinion and the patent related data (Figure 3A, diagrams 58,59, and 60, and column 4, lines 27-34, wherein using an electronic user interface, relational database, and computational component and these features are designed to process input data organized in a preferred rec/del format, wherein this format effectively separates the project into a series of smaller tasks, each of which involves a contract between a supplier and a receiver, and wherein each contract relates in some way to the production of a product, and column 5, lines 21-32, wherein data is stored in database are then analyzed with a computational component to determine the contract and states of each product, Hughes).

Claim 32:

Regarding claim 32, the combination of Hughes in view of Day and further in view of Uchio teaches a computer-implemented information integration system (column 5, lines 24-26, wherein a computational component is a computer program written in a language which is compatible with the database, and wherein integration system is defined as a system in which separate programs perform separate functions with communication and data-passing between functional programs performing standardized I/O routines and a common data-base, Hughes) comprising:

(a) a database for receiving a plurality of patent data (Figure 4, all features, wherein a plurality of patent data consist of identification number, name, due date, received date, and so forth and columns 10-11 lines 54-67, lines 1-5, Hughes), **wherein the patent data comprises at least patent claims, the patent specification and patent abstract** (REFER to claim 31, wherein this limitation has already been addressed, Ohio);

(b) the database for receiving a plurality of entity data (Figure 4, diagrams 140, wherein entity is defined to be something that has separate and distinct existence and objective or conceptual

reality, and Figure 6, diagram 72, wherein the work package agreement (WPA) is defining it's entities as in Project Planning, Science Management Plan, and so forth, Hughes);

(c) the database for receiving a plurality of evidence data (column 6, lines 12-23, wherein evidence data is identifies the data and product analysis data, Hughes);

(d) the database associating the patent data, the entity data, and the evidence data to each other and storing the patent data, the entity data, and the evidence data (column 4, lines 27-34, wherein using an electronic user interface, relational database, and computational component and these features are designed to process input data organized in a preferred rec/del format, wherein this format effectively separates the project into a series of smaller tasks, each of which involves a contract between a supplier and a receiver, and wherein each contract relates in some way to the production of a product and column 5, lines 21-32, wherein data is stored in database are then analyzed with a computational component to determine the contract and states of each product, Hughes).

Claim 39:

Regarding claim 39, teaches wherein the patent opinion concerns whether a specific patent is infringed by a competitor of a user of the system (paragraph [0149], wherein they do not match, an error notification is displayed in S1908, and it is reported to an intellectual property related office and paragraph [0168], wherein n the other hand, if the action case has not been opened, a reminder mail is transmitted to the staff in the intellectual property right acquirement support section and the boss of the staff of the intellectual property right acquirement section, and the staff in the intellectual property right acquirement support section or the boss of the staff of the intellectual property right acquirement section forcibly claims back the action case in S2309, and re-transmits the action case to another staff or process it by himself or herself, wherein un-opened mail is interpreted to be disregarded/infringed and paragraph [0177] and [0178], if the action case is not 'opened' N days, i.e. 3 days, after the transmission date, a visual reminder is transmitted to the staff of the intellectual property right acquirement section on the

necessary display for the action case and when the specified due date has been passed, the action case is painted in color, i.e. for example, blue, different from the color of 2 above regardless of whether or not the action case has been `opened` as a visual reminder to the staff of the intellectual property right acquirement section, Uchio)

Claim 41:

Regarding claim 41, wherein when an issue is identified regarding whether a machine purchased from a vendor is covered by a specific patent, the request sending means send an email to the vendor to request a patent opinion from the vendor regarding the specific patent (paragraph [0140], wherein [0140], the development right acquirement support section transmits a written study request of a case as an attached document of electronic mail to the research and development section, generates a copy case, and transmits a written study request of a copy case as an attached document of electronic mail to another development section. Uchio).

Examiner Response

Applicant argues the prior art fails to teach, "*a person having or provided read-only access to a task/item report*".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Referring to column 3, lines 7-9, wherein data can be accessed via electronic user interface by the various suppliers and receivers involved with the project, column 4, lines 33-34, wherein a contact involves a supplier and a receiver, wherein its inheritance that a project may consist of one supplier and one receiver, Figure 6, all features, wherein work package agreement is equivalent to a task, Figure 4, diagrams 130 and 132, illustrates a task responsible person, i.e. project manager, and one other person, i.e. Nepa Support).

Applicant argues the prior art fails to teach, "*patent opinion and patent claims*".

Applicant argues amended claims in which the argue claim language was not presented within the first office action on merits. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., *patent opinion and patent claims*) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Prior art of Record

(The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure)

1. Hughes et al (US Patent No. 5,893,074) discloses an schedule-control method for managing and controlling projects wherein it is implemented on components that includes an electronic user interface, relational database, and computational component, wherein these components are designed to process input data in a well-defined format called a receivable/deliverable (rec/del) format, and while using the format, the project is broken down into a series of smaller components or "tasks".
2. Saito et al (US Patent No. 6,032,124) discloses a workflow system consisting of a plurality of workflow subsystems connected to a local area network, wherein these workflow subsystems are being composed of servers and clients, in which it provides a workflow system that permits an integrated management of the definitions of the business processes placed under decentralized management, through

the server managing shipping documents, business processes (BP's) that describes the shipping routes of shipping documents in the subsystem, and business process connection data to connect the BPs.

3. Day et al (US Patent No. 6,684,212) discloses a system and method is adapted to utilize the Internet as a medium for providing information and data management and sharing of data between diverse project team members.

4. Uchio et al (US Publication No. 2002/0019836) discloses to provide an information processing apparatus for efficiently managing documents and various procedures related to a patent application

Point of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Helene R. Rose whose telephone number is (571) 272-0749. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am - 4:30 pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on (571) 272-1834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Helene R Rose
Technology Center 2100
July 21, 2006



**ALFORD KINDRED
PRIMARY EXAMINER**